

REMARKS

The Examiner has again rejected Claims 1-12, 14-23, 25-37, and 39-68 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Helgeson et al. (US Pub. 2002/0049749). Applicant respectfully disagrees with such rejection.

In the Examiner's most recent response, it is mentioned that the Examiner is obligated to "interpret each claim in the broadest reasonable sense." The Examiner then relies on this statement to support the assertion that "selectively enabling and disabling business logic rules means implementing the high level object oriented technology which is binary logic based, meaning that is it selectively enabled and disabled (on, off; 1, 0; etc.)"

This assertion, however, is not "reasonable," as the excerpt cited by the Examiner merely suggests that the business application of Helgeson may be implemented using objected oriented technology. The Examiner continues by arguing that the use of objected oriented technology implies use of 1's and 0's (like any digital framework). However, if Helgeson implicitly discloses 1's and 0's, it would require an unreasonable leap to conclude that business logic rules are selectively enabled and disabled, especially since the Examiner is relying on an allegedly implicit teaching that the disclosed business application includes business logic rules.

Specifically, the nature of the Examiner's arguments is particularly unreasonable in view of the specific context in which the foregoing limitations are claimed. Specifically, applicant teaches and claims "serving a content page to a client browser of a client by a server, the content page allowing for entering and modifying of data relating to a business logic rule," "wherein the entering of data includes selectively enabling and disabling the business logic rule via the content page provided by the server."

Thus, following the Examiner's logic, Helgeson would have to enter the 1's and 0's via a content page, as claimed. Of course, however, 1's and 0's are an

NAI1P279/01.024.01

- 16 -

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

invisible digital framework on which computers are based, and can simply not be entered via a content page, as required by applicant's claims. In view of this impossibility and obvious deficiencies, the Examiner's interpretation of Helgeson and application thereof to applicant's claims is not "reasonable."

In summary, Helgeson fails to disclose, teach or suggest any sort of content page that allows entry of data with the specific capability of selectively enabling and disabling the business logic rule, in the specific context of "serving a content page to a client browser of a client by a server, the content page allowing for entering and modifying of data relating to a business logic rule." Instead, Helgeson teaches selection of a command with which processing (not "enabling and disabling") of a web document (not "a business logic rule") is carried out.

Only applicant teaches and claims such a unique ability of enabling and disabling the business logic rule in the specific context of the remaining claim limitations.

The Examiner is reminded that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.* 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim.

This criterion has simply not been met by the Helgeson reference, for the reasons set forth hereinabove. A specific showing of the foregoing claimed features or a notice of allowance is thus respectfully requested.

It is further noted that the Examiner's rejection of the dependent claims is replete with deficiencies. For example, the Examiner relies on the following excerpt to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed "wherein data for each business rule includes general information data, condition data, action data, and schedule data." See Claim 3 et al.

NAI1P279/01.024.01

- 17 -

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

"[0019] A second Internet-based method is disclosed for implementing a business application using high-level object oriented technology and frameworks, the method providing a client input device having a user interface (UI) wherein the user selects a command and a display device whereby results are displayed, and transmits the command to a server computer hosting a business application management system platform, which includes a WDK Web interface server for receiving the user selected command and for processing a web document that is a custom presentation of information. This second Internet-based method also includes receiving at the client input device a display of results relating to the command, the results obtained by an information distributor server electronically coupled to the WDK Web interface server for generating metadata for a business object, for storing the metadata in a metadata database, for querying the metadata database when asked to do so by a requestor, and for providing the results of a match to a query to the requestor; whereby the business application is available via the internet to assist a user in performing a specific business operation which requires location of and use of business objects and display of results of the specific business operation to the user in a dynamically selectable format."

However, such excerpt fails to disclose, teach or even suggest any sort of "business rule includ[ing] general information data, condition data, action data, and schedule data" (emphasis added), as claimed.

Further, the Examiner relies on the foregoing excerpt to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed "wherein said serving the content page to the client browser includes serving an expression builder content page for entering and modifying of the data relating to the business logic rule expressed as an expression having symbols to be resolved when an instance of the business rule is one of created and executed by the business logic application." See Claim 7 et al. Further, the Examiner argues that "expression builder is a grouping of software, all software operates with symbols."

However, the foregoing excerpt and the Examiner's comment fail to address applicant's claimed "wherein said serving the content page to the client browser includes serving an expression builder content page for entering and modifying of the data relating to the business logic rule expressed as an expression having symbols to be resolved when an instance of the business rule is one of created and executed by the business logic application." Emphasis added. The Examiner is clearly not taking into consideration all of applicant's claim limitations.

NAIIP279/01.024.01

- 18 - BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Further, the Examiner relies on the foregoing excerpt to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed data that selectively includes a condition, action, and schedule "expressed as an expression via the expression builder content page." See Claims 8-10 et al. Further, the Examiner argues that "all data is in one form or another action data albeit potential and such information will be operated on (expressed) by software."

However, the foregoing excerpt and the Examiner's comment fail to address that applicant's claims require that the schedule, action, and condition data includes data "expressed as an expression via the expression builder content page" (emphasis added).

It appears that the Examiner is not taking into consideration the full weight of all of applicant's claim limitations.

A notice of allowance or a specific prior art showing of the foregoing limitations, in combination with the remaining claim elements, is respectfully requested.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 505-5100. If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NAI1P279/01.024.01).

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin J. Zilka
Registration No. 41,429

P.O. Box 721120
San Jose, CA 95172
Telephone: (408) 505-5100

NAI1P279/01.024.01

- 19 -

BEST AVAILABLE COPY